

transmitted pursuant to subsection (a) for such fiscal year shall include the information required by section 251(a)(2) of such Act (other than account-level detail) assuming that the deficit in such budget baseline were the amount estimated by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget on August 25 of the calendar year in which the fiscal year begins.

(4) Paragraphs (1) and (2) shall not apply with respect to fiscal year 1989 if the budget transmitted for such fiscal year provides for deficit reduction from a budget baseline deficit for such fiscal year (as defined by section 251(a)(6) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and based on laws in effect on January 1, 1988) equal to or greater than \$36,000,000,000.

(5) Paragraphs (1) and (2) shall not apply if a declaration of war by the Congress is in effect.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I submit, and my quick analysis is, that the President has complied with none of them. Again, I repeat, if the President wanted to tell the American people he sent a vision statement up here, or if he wanted to say, "I sent a sunshine brochure up here"—it is in yellow and looks like sunshine—if he wanted to say that, that is fine. But to suggest that he sent a budget up here is clearly, clearly, a statement without any ability behind the White House to prove it. There is no budget.

Why do I say this and why do I come to the floor? First, some are saying, we should have a budget hearing on the budget. I say to my friend—two are here on the Budget Committee—there is no budget to have a hearing about. We could perhaps have a hearing about the nonbudget if some would like to have that.

Second, it is very easy to submit a budget with bulk numbers if you do not have to tell the public what you are going to do, so that in all the appropriated accounts, you do not have to tell them what you will spend money on and what you will not spend money on. It is another effort on the part of the White House to make everybody feel good and to make sure you feel good about the President's proposals because he has not yet told you what he will and will not do.

I submitted the 31 requirements, and I merely ask the White House and the President to submit a budget at the earliest possible time. I think the public deserves it. I think we deserve it. Again, I say to the White House, you have not submitted one. We understand that perhaps there is a lot of pressure this year and a shortage of time, but it would have been better if you would not have told the public you submitted one when you did not. Make sure when you do submit one that it is a budget, and then we can have hearings on it and let the American people know what is in it.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be permitted to speak up to 5 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Mr. BOND. I say to my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, perhaps because of the fact that the President submitted

five budgets last year, the White House sent down five budgets—the last one did not even pass the smile test—they may have lost their enthusiasm.

I certainly do share the concerns expressed by the Senator from New Mexico. We had the last budget, I guess it was called No. 5, that purported to reach balance by making somewhere between 90 and 95 percent of the cuts in appropriated accounts in the 6th and 7th years. I traveled around my State the last couple of weeks and asked how many people believed the budget was honest if you said you would get to balance by making all the cuts in the 6th and 7th years. That is one of the best laugh lines around. I should have been using that in one of the roasts we had in town because that, from the commonsense folks I talk to, draws that kind of response.

A NEW FARM BILL

Mr. BOND. Let me move on to another item that was included in that Balanced Budget Act of 1995 that was vetoed by the President and that has been addressed already today on the floor. That is a new farm bill.

During the last several days, when farmers and all the rest of us came inside, I had the opportunity to talk to and hear from and answer a lot of questions from farmers in my State. They said, "Why don't we have a farm bill?"

I said, simply, the President vetoed the first one and we were unsuccessful in getting the votes to end the filibuster.

They said, "What are they filibustering?"

I said that is the difficult point. They do not have an alternative.

These people said, "We cannot go back to the old farm bills. What are we going to do?"

I said, "Well, we are going to try again to break the filibuster so the farmers of America and the people who depend on and work with the agricultural sector will know what the ground rules are."

These people who talk to me said, "We want flexibility. It is a lot better for our land. It is a lot better for the environment. It is a lot better for us if we can rotate our crops and we are not locked in to planting corn to keep our corn base," or other crops in which they have a base. They said, "We need to be able to choose what is right for our farming operation, our land, and what we think is best for the market."

I said, "Basically, that is the Freedom To Farm Act."

I think the Leahy-Craig substitute amendment represents the opportunity that the people of America, certainly the farmers in my State, have been looking for: to move forward in a bipartisan way to shape policy on behalf of our Nation's farmers and consumers. The modified freedom-to-farm legislation offers reform, opportunity, flexibility and predictability in a fiscally responsible way and with the growing

support of Members on both sides of the aisle.

I have said farmers in my State have supported the bill. We have reform groups, such as Citizens Against Government Waste, who support this because it does save money. We have the Farm Bureau, corn growers, Cotton Council, cattlemen, pork producers, and the many others who have already been named by my colleagues who have spoken before. I concede we do not have all of the fringe groups who are working to come up with something that fits their particular interest.

I know there is apprehension by some, simply because the reform measure represents change. But I will tell my colleagues, the young farmers, the men and women who are going to be providing food and fiber for the future are ready for change. They want to move away from farming for the mailbox to farming for the marketplace. They want to be able to determine what is best for their operations and get their returns from the marketplace.

We all know this reform package is the only show in town. There have been some good ideas. Others have come up with things. But there is simply no consensus alternative that has been offered by those who are filibustering. There is no constituency for these alternative ideas that spring up and disappear. Neither producers nor farmers that I know of are supporting it.

I must say, I am deeply troubled by one proposal opponents have offered, which would cut farm payments by 60 percent. Some have said on this floor that farmers have high prices, are making money, and having high income. Mr. President, my farmers are not in that situation. My farmers have been hit by flood, by drought, by frost. They have no crop to sell in some instances. They are faced with a refund of last year's advance deficiency payments.

It does not matter if the crops are bringing high prices if you do not have anything to sell. Farmers want and deserve predictability, flexibility, and simplicity associated with a 7-year contract. A known stream of payments will provide certainty to farmers, lenders, and the taxpaying public. It will promote security during difficult economic times, and I think farmers can manage a predictable income stream to mitigate economic risks better than Washington can.

I applaud Senator DOLE, Senator LUGAR, and Senator LEAHY for bringing this bipartisan approach together. We need the votes to end the filibuster. I urge my colleagues to support the cloture motion.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

A COMPROMISE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, in connection with the issue that is before